

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

September 12, 2012

(Approved by the Executive Council on September 26, 2012)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Julie Thompson, <i>presiding</i>	*Ted Crowell	*Andre Larue	*Margaret Pennington
*Paulette Bell	*Terry Ehret	*Sean Martin	*Audrey Spall
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Bud Metzger	*Mike Starkey
*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Brenda Flyswithhawks	*Terry Mulcaire	*Phyllis Usina
*Paula Burks	*Sharien Hinton	*Nikona Mulkovich	

Officers/Negotiators present: Lynn Harenberg-Miller, Jacqueline McGhee, Warren Ruud,
Jack Wegman

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. in Maggini Hall, Room #2801, on the Santa Rosa campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Pension Reform and 180-day Waiting Period. By request from a colleague, Audrey Spall brought to the Council's attention one of the provisions in the new pension reform legislation recently signed by the governor, which would require faculty members who retire after January 1, 2013 to wait 180 days after retirement before returning to work as faculty. The colleague's concern is that regular faculty members who have had 40 percent overloads prior to retirement would lose their like loads of 40 percent for the semester that falls during the 180-day waiting period. (For a brief summary of the impact of AB340 on CalSTRS Defined Benefit members, see http://www.calstrs.com/Newsroom/whats_new/AB340_impact_summary.pdf.)
2. AFA President's Goal: Education. Julie informed the Council that she has a particular set of goals that she would like to work on over the next couple of years. One of her goals has to do with education—not only for faculty and administrators—but also for Councilors, so that everyone is learning context and history, for which the learning curve is fairly steep. Her goal is for the Council to work together and support each other in getting up to speed, while also taking that idea of education out to the College community as much as possible.
3. Council Meeting Reports and Agenda Order. As a follow-up to a prior request from a Councilor that a Cabinet report be presented at Council meetings, Julie commented that there isn't enough time in Council meetings, which are already stretched, to report on another two-hour meeting. She extended the invitation to Councilors to send her any questions they might have via email or to meet with her outside of meeting time and, also, to use their fellow Councilors as resources, so that the Council may use its limited time in meetings more effectively. In response to Julie's comments, a concern was expressed that, if individual Councilors go to her for clarification about what's going on in Cabinet, the entire Council won't benefit from the information that the individual Councilor receives. The comment was made that there is a great deal of information discussed during Cabinet

meetings that would be beneficial for those who are not in attendance to hear. Several suggestions were put forward, including: (1) that the Council should explore further the idea of reporting out of Cabinet; (2) that the Cabinet meeting agenda should be shared, so that the Council has a better sense of which topics might be talked about and which might be of further interest; and (3) that the main reports should be moved up on the agenda closer to the beginning of the meeting, followed by action and discussion items, so that there is less of a need to rush through important reports in the interest of ending the meeting on time, particularly for those Councilors who have to leave early to meet their classes. Julie mentioned that the idea of rearranging the agenda had been raised last spring and confirmed that all of the comments and concerns had been noted.

4. Voluntary Relinquishment of Load. On behalf of a colleague, Margaret Pennington conveyed a concern about the expiration of a provision in Article 16 that allowed faculty members who voluntarily gave up their hourly assignments so that others might have load to preserve their like load patterns for the subsequent like semester. Margaret read excerpts from her colleague's email and from section 16.04.H in Article 16, which outlined this provision. (See <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Articles/art16.pdf> .) The faculty member noted that this section was not updated in the current Contract to continue in the current academic year and requested that Margaret take up the issue of updating section 16.04.H with the entire Council as an immediate action item. Adjunct Negotiator and Adjunct Cabinet Representative Lynn Harenberg-Miller explained that the AFA Negotiations Team raised this issue several times over the course of the last two years at the negotiating table, but the District would not agree to continue the provision. Julie said that the member concern would be noted in the record. She also commented that the full Council has discussed this issue previously and suggested that Margaret speak to negotiators and other Councilors after the meeting.

MINUTES

Following a motion made by Nikona Mulkovich and seconded by Audrey Spall, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved the minutes from the August 22, 2012 Executive Council meeting as submitted (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml> .)

ACTION ITEMS

1. AFA Standing Committee Appointments for 2012-13. Councilors received a draft listing of AFA Standing Committee appointments prior to the meeting for their review. There being no discussion, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Terry Mulcaire and seconded by Sean Martin to approve the appointment of AFA Standing Committee members as presented (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (See AFA Standing Committees for 2012-13 at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/standing_cmtes.pdf and the AFA Policy on Standing Committees at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/standing_committees.pdf .)
2. District-wide Committee Appointments for 2012-13. Councilors received a draft listing of AFA representatives to District-wide committees prior to the meeting for their review. The Council's discussion focused on the following three items:
 - Professional Development Committee (PDC) and Strategic Planning. Julie noted that there remains one vacant AFA seat on the Professional Development Committee (PDC). She thanked Shawn Brumbaugh, who had previously expressed interest in being considered for appointment as one of AFA's two representatives. Julie pointed out that, although the PDC commitment is for the full year, and Shawn is serving as a one-semester leave replacement on the Council, it is not required that AFA's appointee to PDC be a member of the Council. Relevant to the vacant PDC seat, Julie referenced the Fall 2012 College-wide PDA day, which included a set of activities and workshops geared towards movement on the Strategic Plan—an outgrowth of Dr. Chong's vision for SRJC. She noted that due to the

work of the Strategic Plan Task Force, the PDC is being asked to make decisions that will affect PDA Days. Julie asked Councilors to solicit interest from colleagues who might be interested in being appointed to serve as an AFA representative on PDC and who would be a strong advocate for AFA's interests and concerns about professional development as the PDA Day planning process interfaces with strategic planning. (The PDC meets on the second and fourth Thursdays of the month from noon until 1:30 p.m.) Julie stressed the importance of filling the second seat, which will remain open until it is filled, and she noted that the sooner AFA appoints a representative the better. Councilors who have a candidate in mind and interested faculty members should contact Julie via email. In the brief discussion that followed, the comment was made that many faculty members are concerned that the idea of professional development is shifting to institutional development, as opposed to how faculty members can become better at their professions. It was also suggested that SLOs are not professional development issues.

- Adjunct Faculty Compensation for Committee Service. In response to a request for clarification about adjunct faculty eligibility for service on District-wide committees relative to compensation for that service, Julie explained that adjunct faculty members may serve on committees—if appointed—by their own volition. The Council previously discussed the idea that AFA was sending a mixed message. On the one hand, it values adjunct participation, yet there isn't enough money in the budget to pay for that participation, and adjunct faculty should not work for free. In the past, District funds were available (through the Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund) to pay adjunct faculty for serving on committees, and there was a great deal of adjunct participation. Currently, there is only limited funding for a very few committee seats that are specifically designated for adjunct faculty. Julie confirmed that, basically, an adjunct faculty member may serve on a committee; but, since there is no compensation available, AFA will not appoint him or her.
- Designated Adjunct Seats on Committees. It was suggested that it might be useful for the Council to schedule as a future discussion item a review of the District-wide committees on which there are designated adjunct seats, with an eye towards expanding the role for adjunct faculty that already exists, particularly with regard to increasing the budget.

Following the discussion, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Terry Mulcaire and seconded by Brenda Flyswithawks to approve the appointment of AFA representatives to District-wide committees as presented (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (See the list of AFA appointees to District-wide committees for 2012-13 at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/district_cmtes.pdf and the AFA Policy on District-wide Committees at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/district_committees.pdf .)

3. CCCI Fall 2012 Conference: Additional Registration Fees. Julie informed the Council that she was striking this item from the agenda, because it was resolved prior to the meeting.
4. FACCC Fall 2012 Part-Time Symposium. Julie noted that this annual symposium would take place at Pasadena City College on Saturday, November 3. She noted that there is policy language that describes attendance protocol for conferences (see http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/professional_conf.pdf). The Cabinet had a brief conversation about the number of people to send, a deadline for expressions of interest, and the total estimated cost for travel expenses (which include transportation, lodging, per diem for those meals not provided at the symposium, and registration). After consideration of those issues, the Council would need to approve a motion to designate this symposium as an approved conference in order for it to fall under the protocol of the policy, which allows for sending four people with all expenses paid and paid registration fees only for additional attendees. Although AFA does not yet have a current budget for this year (Secretary/Treasurer Paula Burks will be working with AFA Office Coordinator Candy Shell to develop a proposed AFA budget for 2012-13), it is estimated that the cost to send four people would be approximately \$1,000.

Councilors engaged in a brief discussion, during which past attendees spoke to the value of the conference—for both part-time and full-time faculty—and encouraged those who had not had an opportunity to attend yet to consider going this year. Julie clarified that the symposium would focus on part-time faculty issues (working conditions and terms of employment) from the FACCC perspective. Following the discussion, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Brenda Flyswithawks and seconded by Lara Branen-Ahumada to designate the FACCC Part-time Symposium as an approved conference under the AFA policy (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). Julie noted that the deadline for expressing interest has been set as 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 3—one month in advance of the symposium. She asked that those who are interested contact AFA staff. By a show of hands, the following Councilors indicated that they are thinking about going: Paulette Bell, Deirdre Frontczak, Terry Ehret, Mike Starkey, Lara Branen-Ahumada, and Margaret Pennington.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Strategic Planning Task Force (SPTF). Julie explained that Dr. Chong, as part of his vision for the College, has formed a group called the “Planning for the Strategic Plan Task Force” (SPTF). As AFA president, Warren Ruud attended the SPTF’s first and second meetings last spring. Conciliation/Grievance Officer Jacqueline McGhee attended a training session for Fall 2012 PDA Day, and Julie attended an all-day retreat at Pepperwood Preserve the first Friday of the semester. (There are a number of District-wide committees on which the AFA president serves by position, and SPTF is one of them.) Dr. Chong has asked this group to come up with a plan and set of principles, establish a timeline, and start conversations in order to move the College community to a strategic plan that he can take to the Board of Trustees for approval. Julie said that the SPTF is moving quickly and is hoping that Dr. Chong will be able to take a plan to the Board at the end of December 2013. Julie noted that, although the group is very well intentioned and trying to do a good job, she—and others— are concerned that, of the 25 people on this task force, slightly more than half (13) are administrators. The remaining members include faculty, staff, and students. The adjunct faculty is *not* represented, and others have expressed a concern about a lack of diversity on the task force. People have also expressed concern about transparency with respect to communication from the task force to the college community. For example, after the all-day retreat on August 24, the task force published a flyer with only five bullet points. Julie then turned the floor over to Terry Mulcaire, who wrote an article for publication in *Dialogue*, a copy of which was included in the Council’s meeting packet.

Terry Mulcaire explained that *Update* contains news that is relevant to all AFA members, while the purpose of *Dialogue* is for individual AFA members to express an opinion—it is not the voice of AFA. Speaking as an AFA member, Terry wrote an article for publication in *Dialogue* about the Strategic Plan. It was his intention to start a conversation, and he said that he invites and would welcome responses. The issue that bothers him the most is that nobody is talking about the Master Plan, which is in a state of collapse after fifty years. The idea of open admission has given way to the Student Success Task Force. Although he expressed doubt that the Master Plan could be saved, Terry suggested that there has to be a response to its collapse.

Julie then invited the Council to begin a conversation—keeping AFA’s purview in mind—about the Strategic Planning Task Force. Dr. Chong’s charge for the SPTF was projected onscreen and also read out loud. Noting that she represents the Council, and the Council, in turn, represents the membership, Julie asked Councilors what they would like her to take forward to the next meeting of the SPTF, which is scheduled for Friday, September 14. Following are the Council’s comments:

- The SPTF needs to be opened up to a more diverse representation of SRJC.
- The number of faculty on the task force needs to be increased.

- This issue is centrally about our future working conditions. The identity of the College is changing, and our working conditions are going to change. As union members we need to be on top of this.
- I agree that the mission of old is dead. Unless it's replaced by some new mission that everyone agrees with, I don't see the Strategic Plan as having a ghost of a chance. You have to have the conversation about a plan first.
- Similar to concerns about the Professional Development Committee that were expressed earlier in this meeting, the same conception of what AFA's purview is applies here. There is a gradual institutional chipping away at the faculty's professional independence, shifting to a "completion" model, a divesting of disciplines and of what is appropriate to teach in our respective departments. This is clearly an Academic Senate issue, but I don't think it's not an AFA issue.
- Based on PDA Day, I think that PDA Day came before the President's charge was implemented in a way, and that PDA Day should have come after it. PDA Day set a tone that limited the focus on "appreciative inquiry," and the track was set. If we had followed the lead of the President's charge, there would have been a lot more discussion, and then we could have had a PDA day that came out of the task force. The way it was done set a precedent that decisions were made, a vision was made, and an angle was set before PDA Day came about. That's not what the President's statement is saying, and it would have been better if those two things had been more congruent.
- Dr. Chong has talked about three circles: 1) the people who are participating—faculty, in particular— who are always there; 2) the people who are thinking about participating; and 3) the people who that haven't thought about it and don't participate. There is a fourth circle of people who are interested but tired—especially given what we've been through over the past five years. They're tired of false promises, of not being appreciated for the work they have done, and of the division between regular and adjunct faculty. There is this other circle of people that the SPTF needs to know about who are believing that this is not going to be a successful process. The idea of "appreciative inquiry" is upsetting some people. There's a reaction when that phrase is used, because people have not felt appreciated for the last couple of years. There is also a sense on the part of some people across the District—regardless of load and teaching—that there is a select elite or favorites. If you're liked by a certain administrator or chair, you might be appointed or your input might be embraced. If you act in a certain way and agree with them, you're the chosen elect—you're at the table. That's causing a ripple. People don't like that. There needs to be more transparency.
- Everyone at this college sees the transparent blows the college has suffered the last five years. The Student Success Task Force and the completion agenda are coming from Washington and are being forced on community colleges, because they killed the Master Plan. We need to have that conversation. If we can take a step to clear the air, I think it would be productive.
- The members of the task force have good heads and good hearts and are earnestly trying to work with a new model and a new way of thinking, but there's no focus on the "shadow" side. There is no room in the narrative for what we've lost and how we've been taken over by the business model. Closing our doors to students who want to be life-long learners will cause the shadow side to fester. Instead of saying that there is wisdom in all of our stories and that individual stories count and matter, they preempted that by framing the issue from the top down. We need to give the task force honest feedback so the system improves. We're grieving the loss of our Master Plan, and there are a lot of discontented, disillusioned people on campus. If the task force is transparent, it may be able to bring those people back into the process.
- We need a critical thinker on the SPTF, thinking for the faculty. It needs to be appreciated that there's a disillusioned group—people who are good thinkers on this campus—and their voices need to be heard. Those voices may not always be positive, but that's the way

we can move forward and be connected. If we don't speak to these concerns, people will continue to be disillusioned. We have to talk about PDA Day.

- For a strategic planning task force to have no adjunct representation seems very inappropriate, given the model that the College has embraced, which is so clearly dependent upon adjunct instructors to balance the budget and keep us solvent. If our model has shifted away from the Master Plan and a predominantly full-time faculty, to not include adjunct faculty is offensive.
- PDA Day was difficult for adjunct faculty to participate in, and some felt they were left out of the conversation.

Julie thanked the Council for their input and said she would carry it forward to the next SPTF meeting.

2. AFA Contract Education. Julie said that she would like to focus the discussion on education about the AFA/District Contract. She reiterated what she told the Council last spring, which was that Human Resources Director Karen Furukawa approached her about the idea of AFA conducting workshops with management to bring them up to speed on the Contract. Julie noted that this idea is a value for her over the next couple of years, as it is helpful when everyone becomes more knowledgeable about the Contract and better educated before they make decisions. She also expressed interest in Councilors and officers doing some education on their own to help manage their workloads better. In addition, Julie pointed out that, in the Council's relationships with its members, if the faculty better understands what AFA does, it benefits everyone.

On that note, Publications Coordinator Terry Mulcaire said that there are plans to "beef up" the AFA Website (for example, by adding information about the Adjunct Cabinet Representative, and fleshing out the contact information for the Conciliation/Grievance Officer to include information about what the Conciliation/Grievance Officer does). The idea is to use the Website and AFA's publications to disseminate basic information about negotiations and grievances, etc. in order to improve education and communication and reduce friction.

Julie then asked Councilors to break up into small groups, take ten minutes to brainstorm about education that Councilors need for themselves so that they can be more effective, and then share those ideas with the larger group. She noted that she has spoken to Budget Advisory Team Leader Will Baty about repeating the tutorial on the budget that he presented at an AFA retreat one year ago. She suggested that the Council use time during retreats and meetings, AFA publications, and the Website to follow up on these ideas. Following the break-out sessions, spokespeople for each group shared the following ideas:

- In order of priority: Articles 16 (Hourly Assignments), 14 (Evaluations), 8 (Academic Calendar), 31 (Working Conditions), and 24 (Retirement), and the District budget.
- Education for new part-time faculty, so they know about Article 16; the conciliation/grievance process; how the college is funded and, given that budget structure, how budgets are cut and what happens when budgets get cut (i.e., the impact of budget cuts on schedule reductions and AFA's role in that arena).
- Article 16 right of assignment and clarity about what constitutes a grievance, particularly for part-time teachers. Part of what we'd like to see in professional development is education for part-time teachers in Article 16.
- Training for part-time faculty in terms of what happens when they file EDD claims for unemployment insurance benefits.
- Making available to the faculty the glossary of terms with respect to the budget that the Budget Advisory Team put together. (Chief Negotiator Warren Ruud noted that the AFA Negotiating Team has had a chance to review the glossary, and he asked the Council to

review it, also, before the publications coordinator and president make their decision about posting it on the Website.)

- Making the entire faculty familiar with how the Contract and negotiations process works (e.g., which articles are automatic reopeners or opened by mutual agreement, etc.).
- Orientations on Article 14 (Evaluations). In response to a question about what the best mechanism is for reaching adjunct faculty to teach them about this article, members of the Adjunct Issues Committee recommended PDA Day workshops, since adjunct faculty members have a Flex obligation.
- The broader process of negotiations and, more specifically, information about interest-based bargaining.
- Issues and articles that have yet to be addressed (for example, progressive discipline); also, the purpose and possible misuses of Article 14 (Evaluations).
- A regularly scheduled orientation for new members coming on to the Council.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Julie presented brief reports on the following topics:
 - September Board of Trustees Meeting. Following presentations by Associated Students, SEIU, AFA, and Dr. Chong, the Board voted unanimously to approve a resolution of support for Proposition 30. In response to a question regarding whether the College is planning to issue a press release about the resolution, Julie said that she would follow up and report back.
 - Associated Students Request for Support. Julie has not received any response from the Associated Students leadership to the requests for information she has made in face-to-face meetings, follow-up emails, and phone calls.
 - AFA/FACCC Co-Sponsored Educational Forum with Assemblymember Wes Chesbro. This forum is scheduled for Wednesday, September 26, starting at 3:00 p.m. Assemblymember Chesbro will be available from 3:15 p.m. until 4:00 p.m., and there will be an opportunity for questions and answers. FACCC's Director of Governmental Relations Andrea York will also be in attendance at the forum, and it is hoped that she will be able to stay afterwards to provide an update on legislation, pension reform, and EDD Unemployment Insurance.
2. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.
3. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.